

Non-Fermi Liquid in a Truncated Two-Dimensional Fermi Surface

A.Ferraz*

February 24, 2009

Center for Theoretical Studies-Theoretische Physik; ETH-Hongerberg;
CH-8093 Zurich and Institut de Physique Theorique, Universite de Fribourg,
Perolles, Chemin du Musee 3, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland

Abstract

Using perturbation theory and the field theoretical renormalization group approach we consider a two-dimensional anisotropic truncated Fermi Surface(*FS*) with both flat and curved sectors which approximately simulates the “cold” and “hot” spots in the cuprate superconductors. We calculate the one-particle two-loop irreducible functions $\Gamma^{(2)}$ and $\Gamma^{(4)}$ as well as the spin, the charge and pairing response functions up to one-loop order. We find non-trivial infrared stable fixed points and we show that there are important effects produced by the mixing of the existing scattering channels in higher order of perturbation theory. Our results indicate that the “cold “ spots are turned into a non-Fermi liquid with divergents $\partial\Sigma_0/\partial p_0$ and $\partial\Sigma_0/\partial\overline{p}$, a vanishing Z and either a finite or zero “Fermi velocity” at *FS* when the effects produced by the flat portions are taken into account.

1 Introduction

The appearance of high- T_c superconductivity focused everyone’s attention on the properties of strongly interacting two-dimensional electron systems. Basically the high- T_c cuprates are characterized by a doping parameter which regulates the amount of charge concentration in the CuO_2 planes. As one varies the doping concentration and temperature one finds an antiferromagnetic phase, a pseudo-gap phase, an anomalous metallic phase and a d-wave superconductor.

The standard model to describe these phenomena is the the two-dimensional ($2d$) Hubbard model. Starting either from the so-called weak coupling limit or from the large U limit instead one can reproduce at least in qualitative terms all these phases by varying only a small number of appropriate parameters[1]. In particular, for the underdoped and optimally doped compounds, motivated

by the experimental results coming from angle-resolved photoemission experiments (*ARPES*) which demonstrated among other things the presence of an anisotropic electronic spectra characterized by a pseudogap and flat bands in $\mathbf{k}$ -space several workers have related some of these anomalies to the existence of a non-conventional Fermi Surface (*FS*) in these materials[2]. As is well known for the half-filled $2d$ - Hubbard model the *FS* being perfectly square the perfect nesting and the presence of van Hove singular points allow the mapping of this system onto perpendicular sets of one-dimensional chains[3] producing infrared divergences in both particle-particle and particle-hole channels, already at one-loop level. The physical system in this case shows a non-Fermi liquid behavior. However as doping is increased the *FS* immediately acquires curved sectors and this opens up a possibility for Fermi liquid like behavior around certain regions of $\mathbf{k}$ -space. This feature seemed to be confirmed early on by the ARPES data for the underdoped and optimally doped Bi2212 and YBCO compounds[4]. In the electronic spectra of these materials there appears an anisotropic pseudogap and flat bands around $(\pm\pi, 0)$ and $(0, \pm\pi)$ and traces of gapless single-particle band dispersions around the $(\pm\frac{\pi}{2}, \pm\frac{\pi}{2})$ regions of the Brillouin zone (BZ). This agrees qualitatively well with the phenomenological picture of a FS composed of 'hot' and 'cold' spots put forwarded by Hlubina and Rice and Pines and co-workers[5]. In that picture the 'cold' spots associated with correlated quasiparticle states are located along the BZ diagonals. In contrast the 'hot' spots centered around $(\pm\pi, 0)$ and $(0, \pm\pi)$ are related to the pseudogap and other anomalies of the cuprate normal phase. However recent photoemission experiments[6] which have a much better resolution than before put into doubt the applicability of Fermi liquid theory even along the $(0, 0)$ - (π, π) direction. Using their data on momentum widths as a function of temperature for different points of FS, in optimally doped Bi2212, Valla et al show that the imaginary part of the self-energy $Im\Sigma$ scales linearly with the binding energy along that direction independent of the temperature. Similarly, Kaminski et al show that the half-width-half-maximum of the spectral function $A(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$ single particle peak varies linearly with ω above T_c . They claim this to be analogous to both the observed linear temperature behavior of the electrical resistivity and the scattering rate. Those results are very different from those expected for a Fermi liquid and support a marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology even near the $(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ points of the Brillouin zone.

In this work we consider a two-dimensional electron gas with a truncated *FS* composed of four symmetric patches with both flat and conventionally curve arcs in $\mathbf{k}$ -space. These patches for simplicity are located around $(\pm k_F, 0)$ and $(0, \pm k_F)$ respectively (*Fig.1*). The Fermi liquid like states are defined around the patch center. In contrast the border regions are taken to be flat. As a result in this region the electron dispersion law is one-dimensional[7]. In this way in each patch there are conventional two-dimensional electronic states sandwiched by single-particles with a flat *FS* to simulate the 'cold' and 'hot' spots scenario described earlier on. Flat *FS* sectors and single-particle with linear dispersion were also used earlier on by Dzyaloshinskii and co-workers[8] to produce logarithmic singularities and non-Fermi liquid behavior. Here they are used to test

the stability of the two-dimensional Fermi liquid states. We use the renormalization group (*RG*) method to deal with the infrared (*IR*) singularities produced in perturbation theory by the “Cooper”, “exchange” and “forward” channels. Other *RG* methods were used recently by several workers to test the weak-coupling limit of the two-dimensional Hubbard model with and without next-nearest neighbor hopping against superconducting and magnetic ordering instabilities in different doping regimes[9]. However due to the difficulty in implementing their method in higher orders they don’t go beyond one-loop and no self-energy effects are taken into account. As a result the coupling functions always have divergent flows and there is never any sign of non-trivial fixed points.

The scope of this work is the following. We begin by reviewing briefly the model used in our calculations. Next we calculate the one-particle irreducible functions $\Gamma_{\uparrow}^{(2)}$ and $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow;\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}$ up to two-loop order. We demonstrate that the quasi-particle weight Z for the two-dimensional Fermi liquid state can vanish identically as a result of the interaction of the “cold” particles with the flat sectors. We solve the *RG* equation for the renormalized coupling in two-loop order and we find a non-trivial *IR* stable fixed point. Later we estimate how higher-order corrections and the mixing of the various scattering channels affect this result. We calculate the spin and charge susceptibilities and discuss their physical contents. We conclude by emphasizing that our results indicate the instability of two -dimensional Fermi liquid states when they are renormalized by the interaction with the flat sectors of the Fermi Surface and by arguing that they may well be used to describe qualitatively the pseudogap phase of the cuprate superconductors.

2 Two-Dimensional Model Fermi Surface

Consider a *2d FS* consisting of four disconnected patches centred around $(\pm k_F, 0)$ and $(0, \pm k_F)$. Let us assume to begin with that they are Fermi liquid like. The disconnected arcs separate occupied and unoccupied single-particle states along the direction perpendicular to the Fermi Surface. However as we approach any patch along the arc itself there is no sharp resolution of states in the vicinity of the gaps located in the border regions. We assume that these regions are proper for non-Fermi liquid (*NFL*) behavior. To represent those *NFL* features we take the *FS* to be flat in the border regions. In this way the single-particle states which are a *2d* Fermi liquid around the center of the patch acquire an one-dimensional dispersion as we approach those flat border sectors. They represent the ‘hot’ spots sandwiching the ‘cold’ spots in our model.

In order to be more quantitative consider the single-particle lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\sigma} \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(x) \left(i\partial_{\bar{t}} + \frac{\nabla^2}{2} + \bar{\varepsilon}_F \right) \psi_{\sigma}(x) - U \psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}(x) \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}(x) \psi_{\downarrow}(x) \psi_{\uparrow}(x) \quad (1)$$

where $x = (\bar{t}, \mathbf{x})$, $\bar{\varepsilon}_F = k_F^2/2$, $\bar{t}^{-1} = m^* t^{-1}$ with m^* being the effective mass.

When we proceed with our renormalization scheme in the vicinity of a given FS point we replace k_F by the corresponding bare $k_F^0 = Z^{-1}\Lambda\bar{k}_F$ where $\bar{k}_F$ is dimensionless with Λ being a momentum scale. In this way $\bar{k}_F$ can be finite even if both Z and $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$ and the coupling constant U scales with momenta as Λ^{2-d} in d spatial dimensions. Here the fermion fields are non-zero only in a slab of width 2λ around the four symmetric patches of FS . Thus in momentum space the single-particle $\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})$ is defined according to the sector and patch under consideration. For example, in the vicinity of the central zone of the patch defined around the FS point $(0, -k_F)$ we have that

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}) \cong \frac{k_F^2}{2} - k_F(p_y + k_F) + \frac{p_x^2}{2}, \quad (2)$$

with $-\Delta \leq p_x \leq \Delta$. In contrast in the border regions of the same patch we find instead

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}) \cong \frac{k_F^2}{2} - k_F\left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right), \quad (3)$$

for $\Delta \leq p_x \leq \lambda$ or $-\lambda \leq p_x \leq -\Delta$. We follow the same scheme to define $\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})$ in all other patches of FS .

In setting up our perturbation theory scheme two quantities appear frequently: the particle-hole and the particle-particle bubble diagrams. In zero-th order they are defined respectively as

$$\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(P) = - \int_q G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(q) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q + P), \quad (4)$$

and

$$\Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(P) = \int_q G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(q) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(-q + P) \quad (5)$$

where

$$G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{\theta(\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{q}))}{q_0 - \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{q}) + i\delta} + \frac{\theta(-\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{q}))}{q_0 - \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{q}) - i\delta} \quad (6)$$

with $\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{q}) = \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) - \frac{k_F^2}{2}$, $\int_q = -i \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2}$ and $q = (q_0, \mathbf{q})$.

It turns out that $\chi^{(0)}$ is singular only if the $G^{(o)}$'s refer to flat sectors such that $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{P}$ are points from corresponding antipodal border regions of FS . In the case, in which e.g. $\mathbf{P} = \left(0, 2k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{k_F}\right)$ we find

$$\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{P}; P_0) = \frac{(\lambda - \Delta)}{4\pi^2 k_F} \left[\ln\left(\frac{\Omega + P_0 - i\delta}{P_0 - i\delta}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{\Omega - P_0 - i\delta}{-P_0 - i\delta}\right) \right] \quad (7)$$

with $\Omega = 2k_F\lambda$.

In contrast $\Pi^{(0)}$ is singular for particles located in both 'cold' and 'hot' spots whenever they are involved in a Cooper scattering channel. Here for e.g. $\mathbf{P} = (0, 0)$ we obtain

$$\Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{P}; P_0) = \frac{\lambda}{\pi^2 k_F} \left[\ln \left(\frac{\Omega + P_0 - i\delta}{P_0 - i\delta} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{\Omega - P_0 - i\delta}{-P_0 - i\delta} \right) \right] \quad (8)$$

As is well known the Cooper channel singularity drives the system towards its superconducting instability. However at one-loop for a repulsive interactions the renormalized coupling approaches the trivial Fermi liquid fixed point[10]. As opposed to that the singularity in $\chi^{(0)}$ produced by the one-loop exchange channel drives the physical system to a non-perturbative regime. This non-perturbative behavior might be indicative of either the failure of the one-loop truncation or of the inadequacy of perturbation theory itself to deal with that situation. To find out what is in fact the case we consider the effect of higher-order contributions in both one-particle irreducible functions $\Gamma^{(2)}(p)$ and $\Gamma^{(4)}(p)$.

3 One-Particle Irreducible Functions

Let us initially consider the one-particle irreducible function $\Gamma_{\uparrow}^{(2)}(p_0, \mathbf{p})$ for a $\mathbf{p}$ located in the vicinity of a 'cold' spot point of FS such as $\mathbf{p}^* = \left(\Delta, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$. We can write $\Gamma^{(2)}$ in this case as

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow}^{(2)}(p_0, \mathbf{p}) = p_0 + k_F \left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{k_F} \right) - \Sigma_{\uparrow}(p_0, \mathbf{p}) \quad (9)$$

where, using perturbation theory, the two-loop self-energy $\Sigma_{\uparrow}$ is given by

$$\Sigma_{\uparrow}(p_0, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{2U\lambda^2}{\pi^2} - 2U^2 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q - p) \quad (10)$$

The constant term produces at this order a constant shift in k_F which will be neglected from now on. Evaluating the integrals over q we obtain[11]

$$\Sigma_{\uparrow}(p_0, \mathbf{p}) \cong -\frac{3U^2}{64\pi^4} \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{k_F} \right)^2 \left(p_0 + k_F \left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right) \right) \quad (11)$$

$$\cdot \left(\ln \left(\frac{\Omega + p_0 - i\delta}{k_F \left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right) + p_0 - i\delta} \right) \right) \quad (12)$$

$$+ \ln \left(\frac{\Omega - p_0 - i\delta}{k_F \left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right) - p_0 - i\delta} \right) \quad (13)$$

Clearly both $\partial\Sigma_{\uparrow}/\partial p_y$ and $\partial\Sigma_{\uparrow}/\partial p_0$ are divergent at FS . This gives the marginal Fermi liquid result [12] for $p_y = -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}$ and $p_0 \rightarrow 0$ which nullifies the quasiparticle weight $Z = 1 - \partial Re\Sigma_{\uparrow}/\partial p_0|_{\mathbf{p}^*, \omega}$ at the Fermi Surface. We can also arrive at this result using the renormalization group (RG). For this we define the renormalized one-particle irreducible function $\Gamma_{R\uparrow}^{(2)}(p_0, \mathbf{p})$ such

that at $p_0 = \omega$, where ω is a small energy scale parameter, and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^*$, $\Gamma_{R\uparrow}^{(2)}(p_0 = \omega, \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}^*) = \omega$. Using RG , $\Gamma_{R\uparrow}^{(2)}$ is related to the corresponding bare function $\Gamma_{0\uparrow}^{(2)}$ by

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow}^{(2)}(p; U; \omega) = Z(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) \Gamma_{0\uparrow}^{(2)}(p; U_0) \quad (14)$$

where U_0 is the corresponding bare coupling. Since at zero-th order $U_0 = U$ it follows from our prescription and perturbative result that

$$Z(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{3U^2}{32\pi^4} \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{k_F} \right)^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right)} \quad (15)$$

Naturally, $Z = 0$ if $\omega \rightarrow 0$. As we showed elsewhere this result reflects itself in the anomalous dimension developed by the single-particle Green's function at FS .

Let us next calculate the one-particle irreducible two-particle function $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4)$ for $\alpha, \beta = \uparrow, \downarrow$. This function depends on the spin arrangements of the external legs as well as on the scattering channel into consideration. Generically for antiparallel spins up to two-loop order we have that

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4) = -U + U^2 \int_k G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_4 - p_1) \quad (16)$$

$$+ U^2 \int_k G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(-k + p_1 + p_2) + \quad (17)$$

$$- U^3 \int_k G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_3 - p_1) \int_q G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(q) G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(q + p_3 - p_1) + \dots \quad (18)$$

The only one-loop terms are the particle-hole diagram which couples legs with opposite spins and the particle-particle diagram for legs with opposite spins. The forward-channel which is associated with diagrams with external legs of the same side with the same spin only begins contributes to $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}$ from the two-loop order on. The other two-loop contributions are omitted here for economy of space. In contrast, if we now consider the two-particle function for parallel spins we find instead

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4) = -U^2 \int_k G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_3 - p_1) + \quad (19)$$

$$+ U^3 \int_k G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_3 - p_1) \Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_2) + \quad (20)$$

$$- U^3 \int_k G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_3 - p_1) \chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_4 - k) + \dots \quad (21)$$

Clearly the singularities in our perturbation series expansions depend very crucially on the values of the external momenta. Due to this anisotropy of momenta

space different scattering channels produce different divergent results at different positions of FS . As we will see later this automatically requires the definition of momenta dependent bare coupling functions in our perturbation series expansions. Despite that all the existing divergences can be grouped together with respect with their scattering channel and vertex type associated with the singular loop integrations. This opens the way to define a systematic regularization procedure to guide our renormalization group prescriptions throughout all our calculations. Here we follow the convention to define the “exchange” type vertex when its left (*right*) incoming and outgoing lines have opposite spins. We have an “exchange” type divergence whenever the momenta of particles with opposite spins can be tunned together to produce a logarithmic singularity in the one-loop particle-hole diagram. This can be easily achieved in the “exchange” scattering channel for $\uparrow \mathbf{p}_1 = \uparrow \mathbf{p}_3$ and $\downarrow \mathbf{p}_2 = \downarrow \mathbf{p}_4$. In contrast for $\uparrow \mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2 \downarrow$ and $\uparrow \mathbf{p}_3 = -\downarrow \mathbf{p}_4$ it is now the particle-particle diagram which gives the leading contribution in one-loop order. When this is the case we say we have a “Cooper” channel. Now the divergent particle-particle loop can be described in terms of bare “Cooper” vertices. Finally we say we have bare “forward” vertex whenever a particle-hole loop produced by left (*right*) incoming and outgoing particles with same spins becomes divergent. This vertices appear naturally in the “forward” (zero sound) channel for $\uparrow \mathbf{p}_1 = \downarrow \mathbf{p}_4$ and $\downarrow \mathbf{p}_2 = \uparrow \mathbf{p}_3$. Here it is now $\uparrow \mathbf{p}_3$ and $\uparrow \mathbf{p}_1$ which are tunned to produce a $\ln^2$ divergence in two-loop order. In this work we consider only the leading divergence at every order of perturbation theory. Nevertheless since we go beyond one-loop and we include non-trivial self-energy corrections we take explicitly into account contributions which don’t appear either in parquet type or numerical RG approaches. Inasmuch as both the renormalization conditions and the bare coupling functions vary as we move along in momenta space, strictly speaking, we need an infinite number of counter-terms to regularize our model. However all the divergences which appear in perturbation theory can be associated with a loop integration with vertices which are either of exchange, Cooper or forward type. As we will show explicitly later it is possible to define three bare coupling functions $U_{0x}(\downarrow \mathbf{p}_4 - \uparrow \mathbf{p}_1)$, $U_{0C}(\uparrow \mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2 \downarrow)$ and $U_{0f}(\uparrow \mathbf{p}_3 - \uparrow \mathbf{p}_1)$ respectively to cancel out exactly, order by order, all the divergences which appear in our perturbation theory expansions.

To illustrate our argument further take initially e.g. $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right)$ and $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4 = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right)$ with ϵ being such that $0 \leq \epsilon < \lambda - \Delta$. The leading terms up to two-loop order for $p_0 \approx 0$ are (*Fig.2a*)

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4, p_0) = -U - U^2 \chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_4 - \mathbf{p}_1; p_0) + U^2 \Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2; p_0) \quad (22)$$

$$-U^3 \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_4 - \mathbf{p}_1; p_0) \right)^2 - U^3 \left(\Pi^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2; p_0) \right)^2 \quad (23)$$

$$-U^3 \int_k G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_4 - p_1) \Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_2) \quad (24)$$

$$+U^3 \int_k G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(-k+p_1+p_2) \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_4-k) + p_4 \rightleftharpoons p_3 \right) + \dots \quad (25)$$

If we evaluate all diagrams we find

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4, p_0 \approx \omega) = -U - \frac{U^2}{2\pi^2 k_F} \epsilon \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \quad (26)$$

$$+ \frac{U^2}{2\pi^2 k_F} (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) - \frac{U^3}{4\pi^4 k_F^2} \epsilon^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 \quad (27)$$

$$- \frac{U^3}{4\pi^4 k_F^2} (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 + \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[3\epsilon \left(\lambda - \Delta - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \right. \quad (28)$$

$$\left. + \left((\lambda - \Delta)^2 - \epsilon^2 \right) \right] \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 + \dots \quad (29)$$

For $\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ and $\mathbf{p}_3 = -\mathbf{p}_4 = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ up to two-loop order our series expansion becomes instead (*Fig.2b*)

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2; p_0) = -U + U^2 \Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_0) - U^2 \chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_4 - \mathbf{p}_1; p_0) \quad (30)$$

$$- U^3 \left(\Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_0) \right)^2 - U^3 \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_4 - \mathbf{p}_1; p_0) \right)^2 \quad (31)$$

$$+ U^3 \int_k G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(-k; p_0) \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_3 - k) + \chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_4 - k) \right) \quad (32)$$

$$- U^3 \int_k G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_4 - p_1) \Pi^{(0)}(k + p_2) + \dots \quad (33)$$

Evaluating the integrals we obtain

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2; p_0) = -U + \frac{U^2}{2\pi^2 k_F} (4\lambda) \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \quad (34)$$

$$- \frac{U^2}{4\pi^2 k_F} (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) - \frac{U^3}{4\pi^4 k_F^2} (4\lambda)^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 \quad (35)$$

$$- \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 \quad (36)$$

$$+ \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[\frac{3}{2} (\lambda - \Delta)^2 + 2\epsilon (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \right] \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 \quad (37)$$

$$+ \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[(\lambda - \Delta)^2 - \epsilon^2 \right] \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 + \dots \quad (38)$$

Finally, for $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ and $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3 = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ we have that $\mathbf{p}_3 - \mathbf{p}_1 = \left(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon, -2k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{k_F} \right)$, $\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2 = (\lambda + \Delta - \epsilon)$ and our series expansion in the forward channel becomes (*Fig.2c*)

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3, p_0) = -U + U^2 \Pi^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2; p_0) \quad (39)$$

$$-U^3 \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_3 - \mathbf{p}_1; p_0) \right)^2 - U^3 \left(\Pi^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2; p_0) \right)^2 \quad (40)$$

$$+ U^3 \int_k G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(-k + p_1 + p_2) \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_4 - k) + p_4 \rightleftharpoons p_3 \right) \quad (41)$$

$$+ U^3 \int_k G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(k + p_3 - p_1) G_{\uparrow}^{(0)}(k) \chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(p_4 - k) + \dots \quad (42)$$

Solving all the integrals above we get

$$\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3, p_0) = -U + \frac{U^2}{2\pi^2 k_F} (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \quad (43)$$

$$- \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} (\epsilon)^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right) - \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 \quad (44)$$

$$+ \frac{U^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[(\lambda - \Delta)^2 - \epsilon^2 \right] \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \right)^2 + \dots \quad (45)$$

Our renormalization prescription must therefore incorporate this momenta space anisotropy to cancel all the corresponding singularities appropriately. Using RG theory we now define the renormalized two-particle function $\Gamma_{R\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}$ in terms of the corresponding bare function $\Gamma_{0\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}$:

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4; U_a(\{\mathbf{p}_i\}; \omega); \omega) = \prod_{i=1}^4 Z^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}_i; \omega) \Gamma_{0\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4; U_{0a}(\mathbf{p}_i)) \quad (46)$$

where U_{0a} is the bare coupling and U_a is the corresponding renormalized coupling with $a = x$ (*exchange*); C (*Cooper*); f (*forward*). We say we are in an exchange type channel whenever the exchange particle-hole diagram gives the leading contribution in first order perturbation theory. Similarly for the Cooper channel the dominant first order contribution is the Cooper particle-particle loop. Finally when the particle-hole loop with left and right legs with the same spin is divergent we are in the forward channel. Using this scheme for the momenta values above in the exchange channel the corresponding renormalized coupling is determined by the prescription

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4; p_0 = \omega; U_a) = -U_x(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4; \omega; U_a) \quad (47)$$

for $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ and $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4 = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ with $2\epsilon > \lambda - \Delta$.

Similarly, in the Cooper channel we assume that the renormalized coupling is fixed by

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2; p_0 = \omega; U_a) = -U_C(\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2; \omega; U_a) \quad (48)$$

for $\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right)$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right)$. Finally for the forward channel we define

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3, p_0 = \omega; U_a) = -U_f(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3; \omega; U_a) \quad (49)$$

for $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4 = \left(\Delta, k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right)$ and $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3 = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F}\right)$ respectively. Using these prescriptions we find respectively

$$U_x(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_3; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_4; \omega; U_a) = Z(\mathbf{p}_1; \omega) Z(\mathbf{p}_4; \omega) \{U_{0x} [1 + \quad (50)$$

$$+ \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0x} \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \frac{1}{4\pi^2 k_F^2} (\epsilon^2 U_{0x}^2 + \quad (51)$$

$$- \frac{3}{4} \epsilon \left(\lambda - \Delta - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) U_{0C}^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right)\right)^2 + \dots \Big] + \quad (52)$$

$$- \frac{\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C}^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \frac{U_{0C}}{4\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)^2 U_{0C}^2 + \quad (53)$$

$$- \frac{1}{4} \left((\lambda - \Delta)^2 - \epsilon^2\right) U_{0x}^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right)\right)^2 + \dots \Big\} \quad (54)$$

for the exchange channel,

$$U_C(\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2; \mathbf{p}_3 = -\mathbf{p}_4; \omega; U_a) = Z(\mathbf{p}_1; \omega) Z(\mathbf{p}_4; \omega) \{U_{0C} [1 + \quad (55)$$

$$- \frac{4\lambda}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C} \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \frac{1}{4\pi^2 k_F^2} \left((4\lambda)^2 U_{0C}^2 + \quad (56)$$

$$- \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{3}{2} (\lambda - \Delta)^2 + 2\epsilon (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)\right) U_{0x}^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right)\right)^2 + \dots \Big] + \quad (57)$$

$$+ \frac{\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon}{4\pi^2 k_F} U_{0x}^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \frac{U_{0x}}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)^2 U_{0x}^2 + \quad (58)$$

$$- \left((\lambda - \Delta)^2 - \epsilon^2\right) U_{0C}^2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right)\right)^2 + \dots \Big\} \quad (59)$$

for the Cooper channel and finally

$$U_f(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3; \omega; U_a) = Z(\mathbf{p}_1; \omega) Z(\mathbf{p}_3; \omega) \{U_{0f} [1 + \quad (60)$$

$$+ \frac{\epsilon^2}{4\pi^4 k_F^2} U_{0f}^2 \ln^2\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots \Big] - \frac{\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C}^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \quad (61)$$

$$+ \frac{U_{0C}}{4\pi^4 k_F^2} \left((\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)^2 U_{0C}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \left[(\lambda - \Delta)^2 - \epsilon^2\right] U_{0x}^2\right) \left(\ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right)\right)^2 + \dots \Big\} \quad (62)$$

for the forward channel with $Z(\mathbf{p}_1; \omega)$ given as before and

$$Z^{-1}(\mathbf{p}_3; \omega) = 1 + \frac{U_{0x}^2}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[\frac{3}{2} (\lambda - \Delta)^2 + 3\epsilon (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \right] \ln \left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega} \right) + \dots \quad (63)$$

However taking into consideration that the divergencies are removed by local subtractions and at third-order perturbation theory we must have $U_{0C}^2 \cong U_{0x}^2 \cong U_{0f}^2 \cong U_0^2$ there is no mixing of channels if we only do perturbation theory up to two-loop order. As a result the renormalized couplings reduce to

$$U_x = U_{0x} - (aU_{0x}^2 - 2bU_{0x}^3) \ln \left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega} \right) + \dots, \quad (64)$$

where

$$a = \frac{2\epsilon - (\lambda - \Delta)}{2\pi^2 k_F} \quad , \quad (65)$$

$$b = \frac{3}{32\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[(\lambda - \Delta)^2 + \epsilon (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \right] \quad , \quad (66)$$

$$U_f = U_{0f} - (cU_{0f}^2 - 2bU_{0f}^3) \ln \left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega} \right) + \dots \quad (67)$$

with $c = (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) / 2\pi^2 k_F$,

$$U_C = U_{0C} - (dU_{0C}^2 + 2bU_{0C}^3) \ln \left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega} \right) + \dots \quad (68)$$

with $d = (4\lambda - (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) / 2) / 2\pi^2 k_F$.

Using the *RG* conditions $\omega \partial U_{0x} / \partial \omega = \omega \partial U_{0f} / \partial \omega = \omega \partial U_{0C} / \partial \omega = 0$ the *RG* equations for U_x , U_f and U_C in two-loop order are therefore

$$\beta(U_x) = \omega \frac{\partial U_x}{\partial \omega} = -aU_x^2 + 2bU_x^3 + \dots, \quad (69)$$

$$\beta(U_f) = \omega \frac{\partial U_f}{\partial \omega} = cU_f^2 + 2bU_f^3 + \dots \quad (70)$$

and

$$\beta(U_c) = \omega \frac{\partial U_c}{\partial \omega} = dU_c^2 + 2bU_c^3 + \dots \quad (71)$$

Note that there are non-trivial fixed points $U_x^* = \frac{a}{2b}$, $U_c^* = -\frac{4\lambda - (\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)/2}{2\epsilon - (\lambda - \Delta)} U_x^*$ and $U_f^* = -\frac{\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon}{2\epsilon - (\lambda - \Delta)} U_x^*$ for the exchange, Cooper and forward channels respectively which are infrared stable (*IR*) but they are by no means of small magnitude if $k_F \gg (\lambda - \Delta)$ and $\lambda \gg (\lambda - \Delta)$. The magnitude of U_x^* is regulated by the ratio of k_F and the size of the flat sector of *FS* for $\epsilon \cong \lambda - \Delta$. In this case the

larger the size of the flat sector with respect to k_F the smaller the magnitude of U_x^* . For U_C^* and U_f^* there are extra multiplicative factors which measures basically the ratio of widths in $\mathbf{k}$ -space available for the divergent particle-particle and particle-hole diagrams in the Cooper and forward channels respectively. In our perturbation theory scheme the expansion parameter is precisely a fraction of $U_a(\text{width})/k_F$ and even a large value of the coupling constant such as some of the U^* 's above presents no serious convergence difficulty to our perturbation series expansion.

We can use a similar *RG* approach for the renormalized two-particle irreducible function with parallel spins. Now we define the corresponding one-particle irreducible function as

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4; U_a; \omega) = \prod_{i=1}^4 Z^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}_i; \omega) \Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4; U_{0a}) + A(\omega) \quad (72)$$

where $A(\omega)$ is an infinite additive constant since the first term in our perturbation series expansion for $\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}$ is already divergent. As a result using the same choice of external momenta as before we choose the prescription

$$\Gamma_{R\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_4 = \mathbf{p}_1; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3; p_0 = \omega; U_a; \omega) = Z(\mathbf{p}_1; \omega) Z(\mathbf{p}_3; \omega) [\quad (73)$$

$$\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_4 = \mathbf{p}_1; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3; p_0 = \omega; U_{0a}) + A(\omega)] = 0 \quad (74)$$

Using our perturbation series result (*Fig.3*) we then obtain

$$\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}(\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_4; \mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_3; p_0 = \omega; U_{0a}) = \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0f}^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \quad (75)$$

$$- \frac{U_{0f} U_{0C}^2}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} 3\epsilon \left(\lambda - \Delta - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \ln^2\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots \quad (76)$$

Using the same approximation $U_{0f}^2 \cong U_{0C}^2 \cong U_0^2$ as before it follows immediately

$$A(\omega) = - \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_f^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \quad (77)$$

$$+ \frac{U_f^3}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} 3\epsilon \left(\lambda - \Delta - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \ln^2\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots \quad (78)$$

Having established the existence of IR stable non-trivial fixed points in two-loop order we can now investigate how self-energy effects produce an anomalous dimension in the single-particle Green's function at the Fermi Surface[11].

4 Single-Particle Green's Function and Occupation Number at FS

We can use the RG to calculate the renormalized Green's function G_R at FS . Since $G_R = \left(\Gamma_R^{(2)}\right)^{-1}$ it follows from the previous section that

$$G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; \{U_a\}; \omega) = Z^{-1}(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) G_0(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; \{U_{0a}\}), \quad (79)$$

where G_0 is the corresponding bare Green's function and $\mathbf{p}^*$ is some fixed FS point. Seeing that G_0 is independent of the scale parameter ω we obtain that G_R satisfies the Callan-Symanzik (CS) equation[13]

$$\left(\omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} + \sum_a \beta_a(\{U_b\}) \frac{\partial}{\partial U_a} + \gamma\right) G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; \{U_b\}; \omega) = 0, \quad (80)$$

where

$$\gamma = \omega \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln Z(\omega) \quad (81)$$

Using the fact that G_R at FS is a homogeneous function of only ω and p_0 of degree $D = -1$ it must also satisfy the equation

$$\left(\omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} + p_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_0}\right) G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; \{U_a\}; \omega) = -G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; \{U_a\}; \omega) \quad (82)$$

Combining this with the CS equation we then find

$$\left(-p_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_0} + \sum_a \beta_a(\{U_b\}) \frac{\partial}{\partial U_a} + \gamma - 1\right) G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; \{U_b\}; \omega) = 0 \quad (83)$$

However up to two-loop order we don't need to distinguish the mixing effects of the different scattering channels in the self-energy and for simplicity we can assume that the divergences up to this order are entirely due to the exchange channel. Thus the CS equation reduces to

$$\left(-p_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_0} + \beta_x(U_x) \frac{\partial}{\partial U_x} + \gamma - 1\right) G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; U_x; \omega) = 0 \quad (84)$$

From this we obtain that the formal solution for G_R is

$$G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; U_x; \omega) = \frac{1}{p_0} \exp\left(\int_{\omega}^{p_0} d \ln\left(\frac{\bar{p}_0}{\omega}\right) \gamma[U_x(\bar{p}_0; \mathbf{p}^*; U_x)]\right), \quad (85)$$

where

$$\frac{dU_x(\bar{p}_0; U)}{d \ln \left(\frac{\bar{p}_0}{\omega} \right)} = \beta_x (U_x(\bar{p}_0; \mathbf{p}^*; U_x)), \quad (86)$$

with $U_x(\bar{p}_0 = \omega; \mathbf{p}^*; U_x) = U_x(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega)$.

If we assume that as the physical system approaches the Fermi Surface as $p_0 \sim \omega \rightarrow 0$, it also acquires a critical condition with the running coupling constant $U_x(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) \rightarrow U_x^*(\mathbf{p}^*)$ and if we take $\mathbf{p}^* = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ we can use our perturbation theory result for $Z(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega)$ up to order $O(U_x^{*2})$ to obtain

$$\gamma = \frac{3U_x^{*2}}{16\pi^4 k_F^2} \left[\frac{(\lambda - \Delta)^2}{2} + \epsilon(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon) \right] + \dots = \gamma^* \quad (87)$$

As a result of this G_R develops an anomalous dimension given by [11]

$$G_R(p_0; \mathbf{p}^*; U_x^*; \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega} \left(\frac{\omega^2}{p_0^2} \right)^{\frac{1-\gamma^*}{2}}, \quad (88)$$

If we make the analytical continuation $p_0 \rightarrow p_0 + i\delta$, G_R reduces to at FS

$$G_R(p_0; U^*; \omega) = -\frac{1}{\omega} \left(\frac{\omega^2}{p_0^2} \right)^{\left(\frac{1-\gamma^*}{2} \right)} [\cos(\pi\gamma^*) + i \sin(\pi\gamma^*)] \quad (89)$$

Using this result the spectral function $A(k_F, p_0) = -ImG_R$ becomes

$$A(k_F, p_0) = \left| \frac{p_0}{\omega} \right|^{\gamma^*} \frac{\sin(\pi\gamma^*)}{|p_0|}, \quad (90)$$

and the number density $n(k_F)$ reduces to

$$n(k_F) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sin(\pi\gamma^*)}{\pi\gamma^*} \quad (91)$$

Notice that if $U_x^* \rightarrow 0$, $\gamma^* \rightarrow 0$ and as a result $n(k_F; U_x^* = 0) = \frac{1}{2}$. Alternatively if we replace our two-loop value for U_x^* we get

$$\gamma^* = \frac{4}{3} (2\epsilon - (\lambda - \Delta))^2 \frac{[(\lambda - \Delta)^2 / 2 + \epsilon(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)]}{[(\lambda - \Delta)^2 + \epsilon(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)]^2} \quad (92)$$

If we now take $\epsilon = \frac{2}{3}(\lambda - \Delta)$ we find $\gamma^* \cong .07$,

$$ImG_R(p_0; U^*; \omega) \cong - \left(\frac{\omega^2}{p_0^2} \right)^{-.035} \frac{1}{|p_0|}, \quad (93)$$

and as a result $n(k_F; U_x^*) \cong .14$. This result shows that there is indeed no discontinuity at $n(k_F)$. Moreover there is only a small correction to the marginal Fermi liquid result for the 'cold' spot point which suffers the direct effect of

the flat sectors through Σ . The correction to the linear behavior of $Im\Sigma$ is practically not observed experimentally. The power law behavior of G_R and the value of $n(k_F)$ independent of the sign of the coupling constant resembles the results obtained for a Luttinger liquid[14]. However for the one-dimensional Luttinger liquid $\partial n(p)/\partial p|_{p=k_F} \rightarrow \infty$. In order to see if the occupation function shows the same behavior in our case we have to generalize our CS equation to explicitly include the momentum dependence for G_R in the vicinity of a given 'cold' spot point.

5 Green's Function and Momentum Distribution Function near a 'Cold' Spot Point

Let us choose for simplicity the point $\mathbf{p} = \left(\Delta - v, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} - \frac{v\Delta}{k_F}\right)$ in the $(0, -k_F)$ -patch of our FS model. Quite generically the relation between the renormalized and bare one-particle irreducible $\Gamma^{(2)}$'s holds for any momentum value. Thus taking into consideration our perturbative two-loop self-energy result together with the fact that at $p_0 = 0$ and in the vicinity of the FS point $\left(\Delta - v, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} - \frac{v\Delta}{k_F}\right)$, it is natural to define a renormalized $(k_F)_R$ such that $\Gamma_R^{(2)}$ reduces to

$$\Gamma_R^{(2)}(p_0 = 0, \mathbf{p}; \omega) = \bar{p} = \left(k_F \left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} + \frac{v\Delta}{k_F}\right)\right) \quad (94)$$

$$= Z(\omega) k_F \left(p_y + k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} + \frac{v\Delta}{k_F}\right) \quad (95)$$

In the presence of a non-zero $\bar{p}$ the CS equation for G_R in the neighborhood of this 'cold' spot point becomes

$$\left(\omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} + \beta(U_x) \frac{\partial}{\partial U_x} + \gamma \bar{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}} + \gamma\right) G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x; \omega) = 0 \quad (96)$$

Since now we have that

$$\left(\omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} + p_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_0} + \bar{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}}\right) G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x; \omega) = -G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x; \omega) \quad (97)$$

it follows from this that G_R satisfies the RG equation

$$\left(p_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_0} + (1 - \gamma) \bar{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{p}} - \beta(U_x) \frac{\partial}{\partial U_x} + 1 - \gamma\right) G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x; \omega) = 0. \quad (98)$$

We can therefore write G_R in the form

$$G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x; \omega) = \mathcal{G}(U_x(p_0; U_x); \bar{p}(p_0; \bar{p})) \exp - \int_{\omega}^{p_0} d \ln \left(\frac{\bar{p}_0}{\omega} \right) [1 - \gamma(U_x(\bar{p}_0; \bar{p}; U_x))], \quad (99)$$

where

$$\bar{p}(p_0; U_x) = \bar{p} \exp \left(- \int_{\omega}^{p_0} d \ln \left(\frac{\bar{p}_0}{\omega} \right) [1 - \gamma(U_x(\bar{p}_0; \bar{p}; U_x))] \right), \quad (100)$$

and the β -function is determined perturbatively. If we assume as before that the physical system is brought to criticality as $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and $U_x(\omega) \rightarrow U_x^* \neq 0$ we can use our perturbation theory result for γ and these equations reduce to

$$G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x^*; \omega) = \frac{1}{p_0} \mathcal{G}(\bar{p}(p_0; U_x^*)) \left(\frac{p_0}{\omega} \right)^{\gamma^*}, \quad (101)$$

with

$$\bar{p}(p_0; U_x^*) = \bar{p} \left(\frac{p_0}{\omega} \right)^{(\gamma^* - 1)}. \quad (102)$$

The function $\mathcal{G}$ is determined from perturbation theory. Recalling that at zeroth-order, for $p_0 \simeq \omega$, we have that

$$G_R \cong \frac{1}{\omega + \bar{p}} + O(U_x^{*2}), \quad (103)$$

and it turns out that

$$\mathcal{G}(\bar{p}(p_0; U_x^*)) = \frac{\omega}{\omega + \bar{p}(p_0; U_x^*)} + \dots \quad (104)$$

Finally, combining all these results we get that in the vicinity of our 'cold' spot point

$$G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x^*; \omega) = \frac{1}{p_0} \left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma^*}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{\bar{p}}{p_0} \left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma^*}{2}} \right]^{-1} \quad (105)$$

If we now do again the analytic continuation making $p_0 \rightarrow p_0 + i\delta$ we obtain the renormalized Green's function as

$$G_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x^*) = \frac{\left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma^*}{2}}}{\bar{p} \left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma^*}{2}} - |p_0| \cos(\pi \gamma^*) + i |p_0| \sin(\pi \gamma^*)} \quad (106)$$

It follows from this that imaginary part of the renormalized self-energy $Im\Sigma_R$ is given by

$$Im\Sigma_R(p_0; \bar{p}; U_x^*; \omega) = -|p_0| \left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{-\frac{\gamma^*}{2}} \sin(\pi\gamma^*), \quad (107)$$

and the renormalized spectral function $A_R(\bar{p}; \omega)$ becomes[11]

$$A_R(\bar{p}; \omega) = \frac{|p_0| \left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{-\frac{\gamma^*}{2}} \sin(\pi\gamma^*)}{\left(\bar{p} - |p_0| \left(\frac{\omega^2}{p_0^2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma^*}{2}} \cos(\pi\gamma^*) \right)^2 + p_0^2 \left(\frac{\omega^2}{p_0^2} \right)^{\gamma^*} \sin^2(\pi\gamma^*)} \quad (108)$$

We can immediately infer from this result that our renormalized Fermi Surface near the given 'cold' spot point is now characterized by a dispersion law given by

$$p_0 = \varepsilon(\bar{p}) = \pm \left(\frac{|\bar{p}| \sec(\pi\gamma^*)}{\omega^{\gamma^*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma^*}}, \quad (109)$$

which in turn produces a "Fermi velocity" v_F given by

$$v_F = \frac{k_F}{1-\gamma^*} (\sec(\pi\gamma^*))^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma^*}} \left(\frac{|\bar{p}|}{\omega} \right)^{\frac{\gamma^*}{1-\gamma^*}} \quad (110)$$

Clearly for $\gamma^*/(1-\gamma^*) > 0$, we have that $v_F \rightarrow 0$ if $|\bar{p}|/\omega \rightarrow 0$ and is finite for $\frac{\bar{p}}{\omega} = 1$.

Finally, using our spectral function result we can calculate the momentum distribution function $n(\bar{p})$ for $\frac{\bar{p}}{\omega} \sim 0$. We obtain for non- integers $\gamma^*/(1-\gamma^*)$ and $(2-\gamma^*)/(1-\gamma^*)$

$$n(\bar{p}) \cong \frac{|\sin(\pi\gamma^*)|}{2\pi\gamma^*} \left\{ \left[1 + \frac{\gamma^*}{2\gamma^*-1} \frac{2\bar{p}}{\omega} \cos(\pi\gamma^*) + \dots \right] \right. \quad (111)$$

$$+ \frac{\gamma^*}{1-\gamma^*} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\gamma^*}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2-\gamma^*}{1-\gamma^*}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{-\gamma^*}{1-\gamma^*}\right) \quad (112)$$

$$\left. \left[\frac{2\bar{p}}{\omega} \cos(\pi\gamma^*) \right]^{\frac{\gamma^*}{1-\gamma^*}} \right\} \quad (113)$$

It follows from this that

$$\frac{\partial n(\bar{p})}{\partial \bar{p}} \sim \left(\frac{|\bar{p}|}{\omega} \right)^{-\left(\frac{1-2\gamma^*}{1-\gamma^*}\right)} \quad (114)$$

Therefore if $1 > 2\gamma^*$ or $\gamma^* > 1$ we have $\partial n(\bar{p})/\partial \bar{p} \rightarrow \infty$ when $\bar{p}/\omega \rightarrow 0$. If we use our two-loop perturbation scheme and assume that $v \ll \epsilon = \frac{2}{3}(\lambda - \Delta)$ we

can use the value of U_x^* obtained before. Combining this with our perturbative result for $Z(\omega)$ which at the appropriate momentum value is given by

$$Z(\omega) = 1 - \frac{3}{32\pi^4 k_F^2} (\lambda - \Delta - v)^2 U_x^{*2} \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots \quad (115)$$

$$\cong 1 - \frac{3}{32\pi^4 k_F^2} (\lambda - \Delta)^2 U_x^{*2} \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \quad (116)$$

we find $\gamma^* \cong 6/121$. For this value of γ^* the momentum distribution function is clearly non-analytic at $\bar{p} = 0$ indicating that some remains of a Fermi surface continues to be present in the system. Thus for this $\mathbf{k}$ -space region the physical system resembles indeed a Luttinger liquid[14]. Moreover despite the fact that both $\partial Re\Sigma/\partial\omega$ and $\partial Re\Sigma/\partial k$ are both singular at FS the renormalized Fermi velocity v_F can continue to be finite as in an incompressible fluid[15] if $\bar{p}/\omega = 1$. This shows that the effects produced by the flat sectors of FS leads to a complete breakdown of the Landau quasiparticle picture in the “cold” spots. This is in general agreement with recent photoemission data[6] for optimally doped Bi2212 which report a marginal Fermi liquid behavior for $Im\Sigma$ and a large broadening of the spectral peak even around the $(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ region of the Fermi Surface for temperatures higher than T_c . However our results depend in an important way on the value of the non-trivial fixed point U^* . It is therefore opportune to check what happens to our results if we include higher-order corrections. To estimate this we discuss the higher-loop contributions to both the quasiparticle $\Sigma_{\uparrow}$ and $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow;\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}$.

6 Higher-Order Corrections

In 3-loop order with our local subtraction regularization method we don't distinguish the different bare coupling functions at order $O(U_0^3)$. There are in this way two contributions to the bare self-energy $\Sigma_{0\uparrow}$ (Fig.4):

$$\Sigma_{0\uparrow}^{(a)}(p) = U_{0x}^3 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q-p) \right)^2 \quad (117)$$

$$= U_{0C} U_{0x}^2 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q-p) \right)^2 \quad (118)$$

$$= U_0^3 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \left(\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q-p) \right)^2 \quad (119)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{0\uparrow}^{(b)}(p) = U_{0C}^3 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \left(\Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q-p) \right)^2 \quad (120)$$

$$= U_{0x} U_{0C}^2 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \left(\Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q-p) \right)^2 \quad (121)$$

$$= U_0^3 \int_q G_{\downarrow}^{(0)}(q) \left(\Pi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(q-p) \right)^2 \quad (122)$$

with $U_{0C}^3 \cong U_{0x}^3 \cong U_0^3$. However since for $\mathbf{p} = \left(\Delta, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$ we have that $\Pi^{(0)}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{p}; q_0 + p_0) = -\chi_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}; q_0 - (-p_0))$ these two contributions at this order cancel each other exactly for $p_0 = \omega \cong 0$. The next non-zero contributions are therefore produced by the fourth-order terms (*Fig.5*). They all have the same relative sign bringing about a strong mix between the different scattering channels. Their calculation is non-trivial and it is beyond the scope of this present work. However if we include three-loop contributions for the various renormalized couplings we can distinguish the different bare couplings functions at order $O(U_0^2)$ and this produces important changes in our results. To observe this in detail we consider the quasiparticle weight $Z(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$ for $\mathbf{p} = \left(\Delta, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$. We find now

$$Z^{-1}(\mathbf{p}, \omega) = 1 + \frac{3}{64\pi^4 k_F^2} (\lambda - \Delta)^2 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) (U_{0x}^2 + U_{0C}^2) + \dots \quad (123)$$

A similar result also applies for $Z(\mathbf{p}^*, \omega)$ for $\mathbf{p}^* = \left(\lambda - \epsilon, -k_F + \frac{\Delta^2}{2k_F} \right)$. If we repeat the same procedure as before but now distinguishing the diverse bare coupling functions at two-loop order we find respectively

$$U_x(\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_4; \omega) = U_{0x} + \left[\frac{\epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0x}^2 + \right. \quad (124)$$

$$\left. -bU_{0x} (U_{0x}^2 + U_{0C}^2) + \right. \quad (125)$$

$$\left. -\frac{(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C}^2 \right] \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots, \quad (126)$$

$$U_f(\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_3; \omega) = U_{0f} - \left[\frac{(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C}^2 + \right. \quad (127)$$

$$\left. +bU_{0f} (U_{0x}^2 + U_{0C}^2) \right] \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots, \quad (128)$$

$$U_C(\mathbf{p}_1 - \mathbf{p}_2; \omega) = U_{0C} - \left[\frac{4\lambda}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C}^2 + \right. \quad (129)$$

$$\left. +bU_{0x} (U_{0x}^2 + U_{0C}^2) + \right. \quad (130)$$

$$\left. -\frac{(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)}{4\pi^2 k_F} U_{0C}^2 \right] \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) \quad (131)$$

for the exchange, forward and Cooper channels. If we now define the corresponding β -functions as

$$\beta_x(U_x, U_f, U_C) = \omega \frac{\partial U_x}{\partial \omega} \quad (132)$$

$$\beta_f(U_f, U_x, U_C) = \omega \frac{\partial U_f}{\partial \omega} \quad (133)$$

$$\beta_C(U_C, U_x, U_f) = \omega \frac{\partial U_C}{\partial \omega} \quad (134)$$

it follows that

$$\beta_x(U_x, U_f, U_C) = -\frac{\epsilon}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_x^2 + b U_x (U_x^2 + U_C^2) + \quad (135)$$

$$+ \frac{(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_C^2 + \dots, \quad (136)$$

$$\beta_f(U_f, U_x, U_C) = \frac{(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_C^2 + b U_f (U_x^2 + U_C^2) + \dots \quad (137)$$

and

$$\beta_C(U_C, U_x, U_f) = \frac{4\lambda}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_C^2 + b U_C (U_x^2 + U_C^2) \quad (138)$$

$$- \frac{(\lambda - \Delta - \epsilon)}{4\pi^2 k_F} U_x^2 + \dots \quad (139)$$

with $b = \gamma^*/2$ given as before. To determine the fixed points let us choose for simplicity the case $\epsilon = \lambda - \Delta$. Taking $\beta_x = \beta_f = \beta_C = 0$ it follows immediately that the non-trivial fixed points for this value of ϵ are

$$U_x^* = \frac{16\pi^2 k_F}{3(\lambda - \Delta)} \zeta^{-1}, \quad (140)$$

$$U_f^* = 0, \quad (141)$$

$$U_C^* = -\frac{4\pi^2 k_F}{3\lambda} \zeta^{-1} \quad (142)$$

with $\zeta = \left[1 + \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{4\lambda}\right)^2\right] > 1$. Defining the matrix of eigenvalues M_{ij} by

$$M_{ij} = \left(\frac{\partial \beta_i}{\partial U_j} \right)_{U^*} \quad (143)$$

for $i, j = C, x, f$ respectively we can expand in coupling space around these fixed points to find[16]

$$\beta_i \cong \sum_j M_{ij} (U_j(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) - U_j^*(\mathbf{p}^*)) + \dots, \quad (144)$$

Integrating these out we obtain

$$U_i = U_i^* + \sum_j c_j V_j^i \omega^{\gamma_j} \quad (145)$$

where

$$M_{ij} V_{ij} = \gamma_i V_i \quad (146)$$

Using our results it then turns out that

$$U_C(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) \cong U_C^* - \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2\zeta}} \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{4\lambda} \right) \omega^{\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}} + \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \omega^{-\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}}, \quad (147)$$

$$U_x(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) \cong U_x^* + \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2\zeta}} \omega^{\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}} + \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{4\lambda} \right) \omega^{-\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}}, \quad (148)$$

and

$$U_f(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega) \cong \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2}} \omega^{\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}} \quad (149)$$

where c_1 , and c_2 are constants. As a result unless there is one adjustable parameter which can be tuned to produce $c_2 = 0$ we no longer approach the fixed point (U_C^*, U_x^*, U_f^*) as we approach the Fermi Surface when taking the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$. This is the main effect produced by the mixing of scattering channels at higher order perturbation theory. Now the running coupling functions $U_C(\mathbf{p}; \omega)$ and $U(\mathbf{p}; \omega)$ are only infrared stable if there exists an external parameter which could be, for example, either temperature or hole concentration which can be readily adjusted to nullify c_2 at FS . The critical surface formed by the set of trajectories of $U_i(\mathbf{p}^*; \omega)$ which are attracted into the fixed point (U_C^*, U_x^*, U_f^*) for $\omega \rightarrow 0$ has in this way codimensionality one. If we assume that the external parameter needed is the physical quantity θ , in the vicinity of the phase transition the coupling constants associated with the three scattering channels become

$$U_C(\omega) \cong U_C^* - \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2\zeta}} \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{4\lambda} \right)_1 \omega^{\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}} + \frac{(\theta - \theta_c)}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \omega^{-\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}}, \quad (150)$$

$$U_x(\omega) \cong U_x^* + \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2\zeta}} \omega^{\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}} + \frac{(\theta - \theta_c)}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta}{4\lambda} \right) \omega^{-\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}}, \quad (151)$$

and

$$U_f(\omega) \cong \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2}} \omega^{\frac{8}{3}\zeta^{-1}} \quad (152)$$

where θ_c is the critical value of θ at the transition point.

7 Spin and Charge Susceptibilities

Let us consider initially the longitudinal spin (charge)susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$ ($\chi_c(q)$) for $|\mathbf{q}| = |\mathbf{q}^*| \cong 2k_F - \frac{\Delta^2}{k_F} + \frac{\Delta\delta}{k_F}$ which as expected is singular in the exchange (forward)channel. For consistency we define

$$\chi_{zz(c)}(q) = \Gamma_{zz(c)}^{(0,2)}(k) = \frac{\delta^2}{\delta h(q) \delta h(-q)} \left\langle \exp - \left(\int_k h(k) \xi(k) \right) \right\rangle_{h=0}, \quad (153)$$

where

$$\xi_s(k) = S_z(k) = \int_p \left(\psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}(p+k) \psi_{\uparrow}(p) - \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}(p+k) \psi_{\downarrow}(p) \right), \quad (154)$$

for the longitudinal spin susceptibility, or

$$\xi_c(k) = \int_p \left(\psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}(p+k) \psi_{\uparrow}(p) + \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}(p+k) \psi_{\downarrow}(p) \right), \quad (155)$$

for the corresponding charge susceptibility, with

$$\langle \dots \rangle = \int d[\psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}] d[\psi_{\sigma}] \exp - \int \mathcal{L}_E[\psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}; \psi_{\sigma}]. \quad (156)$$

Here $\mathcal{L}_E$ is the Euclidean version of the single-particle lagrangian given by Eq.[1]. Using perturbation theory up to one-loop level with yet no mixing of scattering channels and with the bare coupling as the expansion parameter we obtain to order $O(U_0)$ that (Fig.6)

$$\Gamma_{0zz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; U_0) = 2\chi^{(0)}(q) \pm 2U_0 \left(\chi^{(0)}(q) \right)^2 \pm \dots \quad (157)$$

Since $\chi^{(0)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*)$ is already logarithmic divergent to define a finite renormalized $\Gamma_{Rzz}^{(0,2)}$ we have to introduce a new composite field scale multiplicative factor Z_{χ_s} and a constant term. We have that

$$\Gamma_{Rzz}^{(0,2)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*; U; \omega) = Z_{\chi_s}^2(\mathbf{q}^*; \omega) \Gamma_{0zz}^{(0,2)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*; U_0) + C(\omega) \quad (158)$$

or

$$\Gamma_{Rc}^{(0,2)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*; U; \omega) = Z_{\chi_c}^2(\mathbf{q}^*; \omega) \Gamma_{0c}^{(0,2)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*; U_0) + D(\omega) \quad (159)$$

The constants C and D above can be infinite but they disappear from the problem when we differentiate equation (100) or (101) with respect to $\ln q_0$ [17]. We get in this case

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln q_0} \Gamma_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*; U; \omega) = Z_{\chi_{s(c)}}^2(\mathbf{q}^*; \omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial \ln q_0} \Gamma_{0zz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0, \mathbf{q}^*; U_0) \quad (160)$$

It follows from this that $\Phi_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; U; \omega) = -\partial \Gamma_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0, |\mathbf{q}| = 2k_F : U; \omega) / \partial \ln q_0$ satisfies the RG equation

$$\left(\omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} + \sum_i \beta_i(U_x, U_C, U_f) \frac{\partial}{\partial U_i} - 2\gamma_{\chi_{s(c)}} \right) \Phi_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; U; \omega) = 0 \quad (161)$$

where $\gamma_\chi = \omega d \ln Z_\chi(\mathbf{q}^*; \omega) / d\omega$. Up to one-loop order as indicated in *Fig.6* there is no mixing of channels. Thus we assume that the zero-order coupling is associated with only one of the existing scattering channels. It then follows that taking into account that $\Phi_{Rzz}^{(0,2)}$ is dimensionless the general solution of this RG equation reduces to

$$\Phi_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; \{U_i\}; \omega) = F_{s(c)} \exp \left(-2 \int_\omega^{q_0} d \ln \left(\frac{\overline{q_0}}{\omega} \right) \gamma_{\chi_{s(c)}} [\{U_i(\overline{q_0}; U_i)\}] \right) \quad (162)$$

with

$$\frac{dU_i(\overline{q_0}, \{U_i\})}{d \ln \left(\frac{\overline{q_0}}{\omega} \right)} = \beta_i(U_i(\overline{q_0}, \{U_i\})) \quad (163)$$

and $U_i(\overline{q_0} = \omega; \{U_i\}) = U_i(\omega)$. To determine both $F_{s(c)}$ and $\gamma_{\chi_{s(c)}}$ we have to invoke perturbation theory. We can do this using the perturbation expansion for the bare function $\Gamma_{0z(c)}^{(2,1)}$ together with the appropriate *RG* condition for the renormalized $\Gamma_R^{(2,1)}$. Since $\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z) = G_{0\uparrow}^{-1}(x - z) G_{0\uparrow}^{-1}(z - y) G_{0\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z)$ where $G_{0\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z)$ is defined as

$$G_{0\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z) = \left\langle \psi_{0\uparrow}(x) \psi_{0\uparrow}^\dagger(y) \xi_{s(c)}(z) \exp - \int_w \mathcal{L}_{int} [\psi_{0\sigma}^\dagger(w), \psi_{0\sigma}(w); U_0] \right\rangle \quad (164)$$

it follows that (*Fig.7*)

$$\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(q) = 1 \mp U_0 \int_p G_{0\downarrow}(p + q) G_{0\downarrow}(p) + \dots \quad (165)$$

Using *RG* theory the bare $\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}$ is related to the corresponding renormalized $\Gamma_{R\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}$ by

$$\Gamma_{0\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(p; q) = Z_{s(c)}(\mathbf{q}^*; \omega) Z^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}; \omega) Z(\mathbf{p}; \omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_{R\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(p; q; \omega) \quad (166)$$

If we define the renormalized $\Gamma_{R\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}$ such that $\Gamma_{R\uparrow\uparrow z(c)}^{(2,1)}(q_0 = \omega, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^*; U) = 1$ and taking into consideration that to order $O(U_0)$, $Z(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}; \omega) = Z(\mathbf{p}; \omega) = 1$ it follows immediately that

$$Z_{\chi_{s(c)}}(\mathbf{q}^*; \omega) = 1 \mp \frac{\lambda - \Delta - \delta}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_0 \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots, \quad (167)$$

and $F_s = F_c = (\lambda - \Delta - \delta)/\pi^2 k_F$. As we can see from *Fig.7* the coupling function involved in this process is such that it does not allow the exchange of spins between left and right ingoing or outgoing legs. Following our regularization scheme we can then relate U_0 to an appropriate renormalized forward coupling function $U_f(\omega)$. Assuming that as the scale parameter $\omega \rightarrow 0$ this running coupling function approaches a non-zero fixed point $U_f(\omega) \rightarrow U_f^*$, γ_χ becomes

$$\gamma_{\chi_{s(c)}} = \pm \frac{\lambda - \Delta - \delta}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_f^* \pm \dots \quad (168)$$

Hence, in the vicinity of the Fermi Surface, for $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^*$, $\Phi_{Rzz}^{(0,2)}$ reduces to

$$\Phi_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; U_f^*; \omega) = \frac{\lambda - \Delta - \delta}{\pi^2 k_F} \left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)^{\mp \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta - \delta}{\pi^2 k_F}\right) U_f^*} U_f^* \quad (169)$$

If we integrate this out with respect to $\ln\left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)$ we find that the corresponding renormalized spin(charge)susceptibility $\Gamma_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}$ is given in the form

$$\chi_{s(c)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; \omega) = \Gamma_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}^*; U_f^*; \omega) \quad (170)$$

$$= \pm \frac{1}{U_f^*} \left[\left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)^{\mp \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta - \delta}{\pi^2 k_F}\right) U_f^*} - 1 \right] \quad (171)$$

Clearly $\Gamma_{Rzz}^{(0,2)}$ is singular if $U_f^* < 0$ for $q_0 > 0$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$. In contrast, in this limit, $\Gamma_{Rc}^{(0,2)}$ reduces to $1/|U_f^*|$. The renormalized charge susceptibility is therefore finite for $q_0 > \omega \rightarrow 0$. However if we consider the mixing of channels effect in higher order perturbation theory which nullifies the fixed forward coupling U_f^* the spin and charge susceptibilities in one-loop order reduce to

$$\chi_{s(c)}(q_0; \omega) = - \left(\frac{\lambda - \Delta - \delta}{\pi^2 k_F} \right) \ln\left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right) \quad (172)$$

Nevertheless if we consider those higher order effects in the fixed couplings for consistency we must also take into account the corresponding higher loop contributions for both $Z_{\chi_{s(c)}}$ and $\Phi_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}$. This brings important modifications to this limit and will be discussed elsewhere.

Consider next the pairing susceptibility $\chi_p(q) = \Gamma_p^{(0,2)}(q)$ for $|\mathbf{q}| = 0$ defined by

$$\chi_p(q) = \Gamma_p^{(0,2)}(q) = \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\eta(q)\delta\eta^\dagger(q)} \left\langle \exp - \int_{k,p} \psi_\uparrow^\dagger(p) \psi_\downarrow^\dagger(-p+k) \eta(k) + h.c. \right\rangle \quad (173)$$

If we follow the same steps as before using the fact that $\Pi^{(0)}(q_0, |\mathbf{q}|=0) = \Pi^{(0)}(q_0)$ is logarithmic divergent in the 'Cooper' channel we define the renormalized pairing correlation function $\Gamma_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; U; \omega)$ by

$$\Gamma_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0; \{U_i\}; \omega) = Z_{\chi_p}^2(\mathbf{q}=0; \omega) \Gamma_{0p}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0; \{U_{0i}\}) + B(\omega), \quad (174)$$

where the corresponding bare correlation function, up to order $O(U_{0C})$ in perturbation theory is (*Fig.8*)

$$\Gamma_{0p}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0; U_0) = \Pi^{(0)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0) - U_{0C} \left(\Pi^{(0)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0) \right)^2 + \dots \quad (175)$$

Defining the corresponding $\Phi_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0; U_C; \omega) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \ln q_0} \Gamma_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0; U_C; \omega)$ it satisfies a RG type equation similar to the corresponding RG equation for $\Phi_{Rzz(c)}^{(0,2)}$. Thus in one-loop order we can write its formal solution as

$$\Phi_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q}=0; U_C; \omega) = A \exp \left(-2 \int d \ln \left(\frac{\bar{q}_0}{\omega} \right) \gamma_{\chi_p} [U_C(\bar{q}_0; U)] \right), \quad (176)$$

with

$$\gamma_{\chi_p} = \omega \frac{d \ln Z_{\chi_p}(\omega)}{d\omega} \quad (177)$$

Once again we can use perturbation theory to determine both A and Z_{χ_p} . Defining as before $\Gamma_{0p}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z) = -G_{0\uparrow}^{-1}(x-z) G_{0\downarrow}^{-1}(y-z) G_{0p}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z)$ with $G_{0p}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z)$ given by

$$G_{0p}^{(2,1)}(x, y; z) = \left\langle \psi_{0\uparrow}(x) \psi_{0\downarrow}(y) \psi_{0\uparrow}^\dagger(z) \psi_{0\downarrow}^\dagger(z) \exp - \int \mathcal{L}_{int} [\psi_{0\sigma}, \psi_{0\sigma}^\dagger] \right\rangle \quad (178)$$

we find that (*Fig.9*)

$$\Gamma_{0p}^{(2,1)}(q; U_{0C}) = 1 - U_{0C} \int_p G_{0\uparrow}(p) G_{0\downarrow}(-p+q) + \dots \quad (179)$$

$$= Z_{\chi_p}(\mathbf{q}=0; \omega) Z^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-\mathbf{p}; \omega) Z(\mathbf{p}; \omega)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_{Rp}^{(2,1)}(q; U_C; \omega) \quad (180)$$

If we define the renormalized $\Gamma_{Rp}^{(2,1)}$ such that $\Gamma_{Rp}^{(2,1)}(q_0 = \omega, \mathbf{q}=0; U_C; \omega) = 1$ it then follows that

$$Z_{\chi_p}(\omega) = 1 + \frac{4\lambda}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_C(\mathbf{q} = 0; \omega) \ln\left(\frac{\Omega}{\omega}\right) + \dots \quad (181)$$

and

$$A = \frac{4\lambda}{\pi^2 k_F} \quad (182)$$

Thus if the physical system approaches criticality as $\omega \rightarrow 0$, $U_C(\omega) \rightarrow U_C^*$, γ_{χ_p} reduces to

$$\gamma_{\chi_p} = -\frac{4\lambda}{2\pi^2 k_F} U_C^* \quad (183)$$

and as a result

$$\Phi_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q} = 0; U_C^*; \omega) = \frac{4\lambda}{\pi^2 k_F} \left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)^{\frac{4\lambda}{\pi^2 k_F} U_C^*} \quad (184)$$

Finally integrating this result with respect to $\ln\left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)$ we find

$$\chi_p(q_0; \mathbf{q} = 0; \omega) = \Gamma_{Rp}^{(0,2)}(q_0; \mathbf{q} = 0; U_C^*; \omega) \quad (185)$$

$$= \frac{1}{U_C^*} \left[\left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)^{\frac{4\lambda}{\pi^2 k_F} U_C^*} - 1 \right] \quad (186)$$

It is clear that $\Gamma_{Rp}^{(0,2)}$ is finite and reduces to $-1/U_C^*$ when $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and $q_0 > 0$. The singularity for $q_0 \geq \omega \rightarrow 0$ in the bare pairing susceptibility $\Gamma_{0p}^{(0,2)}$ is therefore cancelled out exactly by the renormalization factor $Z_{\chi_p}(\omega)$. The non-Fermi liquid phase at two-loop level is therefore further characterized by finite charge and pairing susceptibilities and a singular spin susceptibility which might well represent the existence of a charge pseudogap and the absence of a superconducting regime together with strong spin fluctuations.

Notice however that all this changes as we move around in $\mathbf{k}$ -space taking into consideration even approximately the effects produced by the mixing of scattering channels. To see this in a brief schematic form we can define the renormalized external parameter θ which drives the physical system towards the critical regime such that

$$\theta = Z_{\chi_p}^{-1}(\theta_0 - \theta_{0c}) \quad (187)$$

where θ_0 and θ_{0c} are the corresponding bare terms which appears in the renormalized lagrangian as we define a source term in terms of the Cooper pairing susceptibility. It follows from this that θ satisfies the *RG* equation

$$q_0 \frac{d\theta(q_0, \theta)}{dq_0} = -\gamma_{\chi_p} [U_C(q_0, U_C)] \theta(q_0, \theta) \quad (188)$$

with $\theta(q_0 = \omega, \theta) = \theta$ and $U_C(q_0 = \omega, U_C) = U_C$. Integrating this out we get immediately

$$\theta(q_0, \theta) = \theta \exp - \int_{\omega}^{q_0} \gamma_{\chi_p} [U_C(\bar{q}_0, U_C)] \frac{d\bar{q}_0}{\bar{q}_0} \quad (189)$$

Choosing the q_0 such that $\theta(q_0, \theta) = q_0$ we obtain the scaling relation

$$\frac{\theta}{\omega} = \exp \int_{\omega}^{q_0} (1 + \gamma_{\chi_p} [U_C(\bar{q}_0, U_C)]) \frac{d\bar{q}_0}{\bar{q}_0} \quad (190)$$

Since as we approach the critical region $\gamma_{\chi_p} [U_C(\bar{q}_0, U_C)] \rightarrow \gamma_{\chi_p}(U_C^*)$ this reduces to

$$\frac{\theta}{q_0} = \left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)^{\gamma_{\chi_p}(U_C^*)} \quad (191)$$

However using our previous results and the fact the the coupling function are dimensionless we must have that $q_0 \sim \theta^{\frac{3}{8}\zeta} = \theta^\nu$ with $\nu = \frac{3}{8}\zeta < 1$. Thus it follows from this that

$$\left(\frac{q_0}{\omega}\right)^{-2\gamma_{\chi_p}(U_C^*)} \sim \theta^{-2(1-\nu)} \quad (192)$$

and therefore both $\Phi_{Rp}^{(0,2)}$ and $\chi_p \rightarrow \infty$ as a power law when $\theta \rightarrow 0$ signalling the superconducting transition when θ is tuned to drive the physical system towards criticality.

8 Conclusion

We present a two-loop field-theoretical renormalization group calculation of a two-dimensional truncated Fermi Surface. Our Fermi Surface model consists of four disconnected patches with both flat pieces and conventionally curved arcs centered around $(0, \pm k_F)$ and $(\pm k_F, 0)$ in $\mathbf{k}$ -space. Two-dimensional Fermi liquid like states are defined around the central region of each patch. In contrast the patch border regions are flat and as a result their associated single particle states have linear dispersion law. These flat sectors are introduced specifically to produce nesting effects which in turn generate logarithmic singularities in the particle-hole channels that give non-Fermi liquid effects. In this way conventional 2d Fermi liquid states are sandwiched by single particles with a linear dispersion law to simulate the so-called “cold” spots as in the experimentally observed truncated Fermi Surface of the underdoped normal phase of the high-temperature superconductors. Our main motivation here is to test to what extent Fermi liquid theory is applicable in the presence of flat Fermi surface sectors which are indicative of a strong coupling regime. New experimental data on both optimally doped and underdoped Bi2212[6] above T_c indicate that the imaginary part of the self-energy $Im\Sigma(\omega)$ scales linearly with

ω even along the $(0,0)$ - (π,π) direction. This is consistent with other photoemission experiments[6] which support a marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology over the whole Fermi Surface. Our results are in general agreement with those experimental findings since the power law corrections we find for this linear behavior can in some cases be so small as not to be detectable by the present day experiments. Using perturbation theory we calculate the two-loop self-energy of a single particle associated with a curved FS sector. We find that the bare self-energy is such that $Im\Sigma_o(\omega) \sim \omega$ and as a result $Re\Sigma_o(\omega) \sim \omega \ln(\frac{\Omega}{\omega})$ for $\omega \sim 0$ reproducing the marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology at FS . We calculate Σ_0 as a function of both frequency and momentum. It turns out that both $\partial\Sigma_0/\partial p_0$ and $\partial\Sigma_0/\partial \bar{p}$ diverge at FS . Using RG theory we determine the renormalized one-particle irreducible function $\Gamma_R^{(2)}(p_0, \mathbf{p}; U, \omega)$ in the vicinity of a “cold” spot FS point. Again it follows immediately that the quasiparticle weight Z vanishes identically at the Fermi Surface. Next we calculate the bare one-particle irreducible two-particle function $\Gamma_{0\alpha\beta}^{(4)}(p_1, p_2; p_3, p_4)$ for $\alpha, \beta = \uparrow, \downarrow$. This function depends on the spin arrangements as well as on the relative momenta of its external legs. There are three different scattering channels associated with the $\Gamma_{0\alpha\beta}^{(4)}$ ’s : the so-called Cooper, exchange and forward channels. For a FS with flat sectors there are logarithmic singularities in $\Gamma_{0\alpha\beta}^{(4)}$ for both exchange and forward channels due to nesting effects. In contrast the Cooper channel produces similar singularities in the whole FS . We calculate $\Gamma_0^{(4)}$ perturbatively up to two-loop order for the mentioned scattering channels. Taking into account self-energy corrections calculated earlier on we obtain the corresponding renormalized one-particle irreducible function $\Gamma_R^{(4)}$ subjected to an appropriate renormalization condition. The field theory regularization scheme allow us to introduce local counterterms to cancels all divergences order by order in perturbation theory. This simplifies the problem considerably although due to the anisotropy in $\mathbf{k}$ - space the counterterms are in fact momenta dependent. The bare coupling constant becomes a bare coupling function and we proceed with the regularization of the divergences grouping them together according to their location at FS , the scattering channel and the vertex type interaction. We introduce in this way three bare coupling functions $U_{0x}(\mathbf{p})$, $U_{0C}(\mathbf{p})$ and $U_{0f}(\mathbf{p})$ to systematically cancel all the local divergences in our perturbation theory expansions. In this scheme the effects produced by the crossing of different channels is practically non-existent up to the two-loop order calculation of the self-energy. Therefore if we only consider the leading divergence at every order of perturbation theory it is essential to proceed with the renormalization of fields in order for the running coupling functions to develop non-trivial infrared (IR) stable fixed points. As opposed to the parquet or the Wilsonian RG methods we don’t try to derive an effective action in explicit form. This would in practice demand the introduction of an infinite number of local counterterms in our lagrangian model. Nevertheless all divergences can be removed to all orders by local subtractions around a given point of momentum space. The anisotropy of the Fermi Surface therefore reflects itself directly in the momentum dependence of the coupling parameters. This feature is consistent with the

findings of those other two approaches referred before. However since we take explicit into account self-energy even if we don't go beyond the leading divergence approximation and we are able to find non-trivial fixed point solutions in our higher loop calculations. With our two-loop results for the non-trivial fixed points together with the assumption that the physical system acquires a critical condition as we approach the Fermi Surface by taking the scale parameter $\omega \rightarrow 0$ we can solve the *RG* equation for the renormalized single particle propagator $G_R(p; U, \omega)$ in the vicinity of a chosen “cold” spot point. We show that the nullification of the quasiparticle weight Z manifests itself as an anomalous dimension in G_R . This anomalous dimension is independent of the sign of the given fixed point value. Using this result we calculate the spectral function $A_R(p; U^*, \omega)$ and the renormalized single particle dispersion law. From this we calculate the “Fermi velocity” which can either remain finite or is nullified at *FS*. Finally we calculate the corresponding momentum distribution function $n(\bar{p})$ in the vicinity of *FS* and show that it is a continuous function of $\bar{p}$ with $\partial n(\bar{p})/\partial \bar{p}$ finite or $\partial n(\bar{p})/\partial \bar{p} \rightarrow \infty$ when $\bar{p}/\omega \rightarrow 0$. In the former case we have a real charge gap typical of an insulating state and in the latter the physical system continues to be metallic and resembles a Luttinger liquid. There could be in this way phase separation in $\mathbf{k}$ -space and there is a complete breakdown of the Landau Fermi liquid when the “cold” spot suffers the effects produced by the flat *FS* sectors. Since essentially the *RG* exponentiates the self-energy in corrections the power law behavior of G_R reflects itself back in the renormalized self-energy given

$$Im\Sigma_R(\mathbf{p}; U^*) \sim -|p_0| \left(\frac{p_0^2}{\omega^2} \right)^{-\frac{\gamma^*(\mathbf{p}; U^*)}{2}} \quad (193)$$

with γ^* depending on the size of the size of the flat Fermi Surface sectors through the fixed point coupling strength. For certain $\mathbf{k}$ -space regions near *FS* we show that $\gamma^* \simeq 6/121$. This produces a singular $\partial n(\bar{p})/\partial \bar{p} \rightarrow \infty$ and is consistent with the marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology which is in agreement with the observed experimental results.

Since several of our results are given in terms of a fixed point value it is important to see what happens if we consider higher order contributions to our perturbation theory expansions. We do this calculating initially the 3-loop corrections to the bare self-energy $\Sigma_{0\uparrow}$. At this order of perturbation theory we have the bare constants $U_{0C}^3 \cong U_{0x}^3 \cong U_{0f}^3$ identical to each other. As a result the two existing contributions in this order cancel each other exactly for $p_0 \sim \omega \sim 0$. However if we consider 3-loop terms in our perturbative calculation of the three bare couplings we can distinguish the different contributions produced at order $O(U_0^2)$ and this brings important changes to our results. The exchange and Cooper channel couplings mix strongly with each other. As a result of this we define generalized β -functions by considering $\beta_i = \omega \partial U_i / \partial \omega = \beta_i(U_C, U_x, U_f)$ for $i = C, x, f$. We calculate the eigenvalue matrix $M_{ij} = \frac{\partial \beta_i}{\partial U_j^*}$, find its eigenvalues and expand these β -functions in coupling space around one of the existing fixed points in $\mathbf{k}$ -space. We then show that the critical surface formed

by the set of trajectories of $U_i(\mathbf{p}; \omega)$ which is attracted into the fixed point $(U_C^*(\mathbf{p}), U_x^*(\mathbf{p}), U_f^*(\mathbf{p}))$ for $\omega \rightarrow 0$ has codimensionality one. This means that one external parameter such as temperature or hole concentration is needed to drive the physical system towards its phase transition characterized by its fixed points (U_C^*, U_x^*, U_f^*) 's.

To enquire about the nature of our non-Fermi state and to find out how it reacts to its various instabilities we calculate the longitudinal susceptibility χ_s , the charge susceptibility χ_c and the pairing susceptibility χ_p around a given point of momentum space. These functions are obtained from appropriate RG equations which are solved perturbatively if the renormalized running coupling functions are precisely at the non-trivial fixed point. For simplicity we use perturbation theory up to one-loop order and as a result there is no strong mixing of scattering channels. Both χ_s and χ_c are linked to the forward scattering channel. Since $U_f^* < 0$ in two-loop order the corresponding multiplicative renormalization constants Z_{χ_s} and Z_{χ_c} produce cancellation effects in $\chi_c(q_0; \mathbf{q}; \omega)$ but not in $\chi_s(q_0; \mathbf{q}; \omega)$ since it continues to have a power law singularity for $q_0 > \omega$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$. Moreover in this order of perturbation theory we show that the pairing susceptibility $\chi_p(q_0; \mathbf{q}; \omega)$ is finite at the fixed point for $q_0 > \omega$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$ since U_C^* is non-zero and the Cooper singularity is cancelled exactly by the renormalization factor Z_{χ_p} . This result depends on the location of the interacting particles at the Fermi Surface and as a result it changes as we move around in $\mathbf{k}$ -space reflecting strong anisotropy effects. Nevertheless this shows that this corresponding non-Fermi liquid state is non-superconducting with a finite χ_c which could be indicative of charge incompressibility or charge pseudo gap behavior [18] together with strong spin fluctuations. As a matter of fact an external parameter θ must be tuned for the system to approach the critical region and the superconducting transition. Using a simple scaling argument we then show that in this case the pairing susceptibility χ_p diverges as a power law when $\theta \rightarrow 0$ in the superconducting critical point.

To conclude it is fair to say that even a simplified anisotropic Fermi Surface model as the one used in this work is able to produce interesting non-trivial results due to the fact that it contains flat parts which are indicative of a strong interaction regime. They can turn $2d$ -Fermi liquid states into a non-Fermi liquid which can be metallic or insulating depending on its location at the Fermi Surface in $\mathbf{k}$ -space. It is tempting to relate our results to the high T_c superconductors which are known to have an anisotropic FS with a pseudogap which show non-Fermi liquid behavior for the underdoped and optimally doped metallic phase above the critical temperature. Our findings concerning the nature of the metallic state are in general agreement with more recent photoemission experiments which demonstrate the validity of the marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology above T_c . We believe therefore the model presented here might well contain some of the ingredients which are needed to describe the strange metal and the pseudogap phases of the cuprate superconductors.

Acknowledgements- I am grateful to T.M.Rice, C.Honerkamp and K.Voelker (ETH – Zurich) and D.Baeriswyl, B.Binz, C.Morais-Smith and C.Aebischer

(*ITP – Fribourg*) for several stimulating discussions. Discussions with Peter Kopietz and with Benham Farid are also greatly appreciated. Finally I also want to thank the Center for Theoretical Studies-ETH-Zurich, the Institute de Physique Theorique-Univ. de Fribourg and the Swiss National Foundation for their very nice hospitality. This work is partially supported by the CNPq (*Brazil*).

* *permanent address*: Centro Intl. de Fis. da Mat. Condensada-UnB, Brasilia-DF (*Brazil*).

Figure Captions:

Fig. 1- Truncated Fermi Surface Model

Figs. 2- Feynmann diagrams up to 2-loop order for $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(4)}$ in the: (a) exchange channel, (b)Cooper channel and (c) forward channel

Fig.3- Diagrams up two-loop order for $\Gamma_{\uparrow\uparrow}^{(4)}$

Fig.4- Diagrams for $\Sigma_{\uparrow}$ in 3-loop order

Fig.5- 4-loop diagrams for $\Sigma_{\uparrow}$

Fig.6- $\Gamma_{0zz(c)}^{(0,2)}$ up to one-loop order

Fig.7- $\Gamma_{0zz(c)}^{(2,1)}$ up to one-loop order

Fig.8- $\Gamma_{0p}^{(0,2)}$ up to one-loop order

Fig.9- $\Gamma_{0p}^{(2,1)}$ up to one-loop order

References

- [1] J.R.Schrieffer, X.G.Wen, and S.C.Zhang, Phys.Rev.B 39 (1989)11663; Y.M.Vilk, L.Chen, and A.M.S.Tremblay, Phys.Rev.B 4 (1994)13267; T.Saikawa and A.Ferraz, Eur.Phys.J.(2001) to be published
- [2] See e.g. N.Furukawa, T.M.Rice, and M.Salmhofer, Phys.Rev.Lett. 81 (1998)3195; J.Gonzalez, F.Guinea, and M.A.H.Vozmediano, Phys.Rev.Lett. 79 (1997)3514 and Nucl.Phys.B 485 [FS] 694; J.Gonzalez, Phys.Rev. B63 (2001)45114; H.J.Schulz, Europhys.Lett. 4 (1987)609; I.E.Dzyaloshinskii, Sov.Phys.JETP 66 (1987)848; J.Ruvalds et al., Phys. Rev.B 51 (1995) 3797
- [3] A.Luther, Phys.Rev.B 50 (1994)11446
- [4] J.C.Campuzano et al., Phys.Rev.Lett 64 (1990)2308; D.S.Dessau et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 71 (1993)2781; A.G.Loesser et al., Science 285 (1996)325; H.Ding et al., Nature 382 (1996)51
- [5] R.Hlubina and T.M.Rice, Phys.Rev. B51 (1995)9253; B.P.Stojkovic and D.Pines, Phys.Rev.Lett. 76 (1996)811
- [6] T.Valla et al., Science 273 (1999)2110; Phys.Rev.Lett. 85 (2000)828; Kamin-ski et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 84 (2000)1788; cond-mat./ 0004482; Bogdanov et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 85 (2000)2581
- [7] A.Ferraz, T.Saikawa, and Z.Y.Weng, Mod.Phys.Lett. B 13 (1999)1031

- [8] A.T.Zheleznyak, V.M.Yakovenko, and I.E.Dzyaloshinskii, Phys.Rev.B 55 (1998)3200
- [9] D.Zanchi and H.J.Schulz, Phys.Rev.B 61 (2000)13609; C.J.Halboth and W.Metzner, Phys.Rev.B 61 (2000)7364; C.Honerkamp et al., Phys.Rev.B 63 (2001)35109; P.Kopietz and T.Busche, cond-mat/0103633; B.Binz, D.Baeriswyl, and B.Ducot, cond-mat/0104424 (2001)
- [10] R.Shankar, Rev.Mod.Phys. 66 (1994)129; J.Polchinski, in 1992 TASI in Elementary Particle Physics, edited by J.Harvey and J. Polchinski, World Scientific (1992)
- [11] A.Ferraz, submitted for publication (2001)
- [12] C.M.Varma et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 63 (1989)1996
- [13] See e.g. J.C.Collins, Renormalization, C.U.P. (1985) and S. Pokorski, Gauge Field Theories, C.U.P. (1987)
- [14] D.C.Mattis and E.H.Lieb, J.Math.Phys. 6 (1965)304
- [15] P.W.Anderson, The Theory of Superconductivity in High T_c Cuprates, Princenton Univ.Press (1997). See also B.Farid, Phil Mag B79 (1999) 1097
- [16] See e.g. S.Weinberg, The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol.2, C.U.P. (1996)
- [17] J.Solyom, Adv. in Phys. 28 (1979)201
- [18] D.Zanchi, cond-mat/0104130